

REMARKS

This is in response to the office action mailed December 21, 2005. Please find enclosed (1) a Petition for a three month extension of time to file this response, together with the relevant fee; and (2) Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal, together with relevant fee. In view of the RCE, the finality of the last office action is no longer an issue and the claim amendments set forth above should be entered into this application.

Claims 1 to 20 are in this application. In this response, claims 1, 17 and 20 have been minimally amended to clarify a claimed aspect of the invention. Based on the amendments as well as the brief discussion below, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-12, 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Zeitman and further in view of DeLorme. The remaining claims are rejected under the same provision and based on the same references with various other references.

The Examiner cites DeLorme as disclosing "the user having directly or indirectly a lease agreement relating at least in

part to the parking facility". This finding is completely erroneous and does not reflect in any manner or form what DeLorme discloses. The Examiner appears to have run in to the word "lease" and made an arbitrary and unjustified conclusion without considering anything else.

The Examiner is specifically invited to point out to the Applicant exactly where (column and line) DeLorme teaches checking for consistency between a lease and a parking reservation.

There are two references to the word "lease" in DeLorme, a patent stretching for 88 columns. These are found in claims 36 and 49. These references to a "lease" have absolutely nothing to do with a building or property lease agreement, nor does DeLorme teach or even suggest the step of accessing a lease for the purpose of checking consistency between a property lease and a parking reservation.

The DeLorme patent is so devoid of relevant content that the Applicant cannot even offer a meaningful or intelligent analysis.

In view of the claims amendments as well as the discussion above, reconsideration of the claims and allowance of the

June 21, 2005

application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at telephone number (818)710-2788 should there be any questions at this time.

Please acknowledge receipt hereof by stamping and returning the enclosed postcard.

Respectfully submitted,




Colin P. Abrahams
Attorney for Applicant (Reg. No. 32,393)
5850 Canoga Avenue, Suite 400
Woodland Hills, California 91367
Tel: (818) 710-2788; Fax: (818) 710-2798

Enclosed: Request for Continued Examination Transmittal
Petition for extension
Return postcard

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 21, 2005.



Colin P. Abrahams